

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE MATERIALS

Study 1: Vignette

Results for the Original Measures:

Table S1

Means and Standard Deviations of Affective and Motivational Evaluations as a Function of Evaluator's Commitment and Player's Strategy in Study 1

| Player's Strategy | Affective Evaluation | | Motivation to Pursue a Romantic Relationship | | Willingness to Spend on a Gift (in HK\$) | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|----------------|--|--------------------|
| | Random Girl | Chosen Girl | Random Girl | Chosen Girl | Random Girl | Chosen Girl |
| Hard to get | 1.87 (.90) | 2.78 (1.09) | 1.92 (1.02) | 4.93 (1.54) | 67.50 (73.99) | 314.07 (404.54) |
| Easy to get | 6.32 (1.11) | 7.72 (.98) | 4.12 (1.62) | 4.08 (1.38) | 114.40 (120.05) | 172.80 (134.46) |

Note: 1 US\$ = 7.8 HK\$

Study 2: Speed Dating

Pre-meeting:

Measures

In each speed-dating session, the participant first filled out a "pre-meeting" questionnaire. Three questions were a manipulation check of participants' commitment to their dating partners: (1) how motivated they were to convince their speed-dating partner to befriend them (1=*not motivated at all*, 7=*very motivated*); (2) if they were given a chance to meet another speed-dating partner rather than the current one, would they want to stick with the current one or switch to another one (1=*indifferent between stick to the current one and switch*, 7=*strongly motivated to stick to the current one*); and (3) how

much they cared about their partners' responses to them during the conversation (1=*not at all*, 7=*very much*).

We also checked whether participants in the no-commitment and commitment conditions might ex-ante have had different pre-date expectations of their performance, which could systematically affect their subsequent post-date evaluations. To probe for this possibility, we included two more questions in the questionnaire: (1) how confident they were that they would impress their dating partner (1=*not confident at all*, 7=*very confident*) and (2) how likely their partner was to have a positive view of them (1=*not likely at all*, 7=*very likely*).

Results

Pre-meeting questionnaire results showed that participants in the commitment condition indeed had greater psychological commitment to the player than participants in the no-commitment condition did (Q1: $M_{\text{commit}} = 5.03$, $SD = 1.10$; $M_{\text{no-commit}} = 4.13$, $SD = .846$; $t(59) = 3.61$, $p = .001$; Q2: $M_{\text{commit}} = 4.57$, $SD = 1.10$; $M_{\text{no-commit}} = 3.42$, $SD = .85$; $t(59) = 4.56$, $p < .001$; Q3: $M_{\text{commit}} = 5.20$, $SD = .81$; $M_{\text{no-commit}} = 4.45$, $SD = 1.57$; $t(59) = 2.33$, $p = .023$).

Also, participants in all conditions did not differ in terms of their confidence level (no-commitment: $M_{\text{easy-to-get}} = 4.19$, $SD = 1.38$; $M_{\text{hard-to-get}} = 4.07$, $SD = 1.03$; commitment: $M_{\text{easy-to-get}} = 3.73$, $SD = .96$; $M_{\text{hard-to-get}} = 4.27$, $SD = 1.16$; $F_s < 1$), and subjective performance expectations (no-commitment: $M_{\text{easy-to-get}} = 4.63$, $SD = .96$; $M_{\text{hard-to-get}} = 4.59$, $SD = .63$; commitment: $M_{\text{easy-to-get}} = 4.33$, $SD = .72$; $M_{\text{hard-to-get}} = 4.61$, $SD = .99$; $F_s < 1$).

Post-meeting: Results for the Original Measures

Table S2

Means and Standard Deviations of Affective and Motivational Evaluations as a Function of Evaluator's Commitment and Player's Strategy in Study 2.

| | | Commitment Level | | | |
|---------------------|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | No Commitment | | Commitment | |
| | | Hard to get | Easy to get | Hard to get | Easy to get |
| Liking Measures | Feeling toward Partner | 3.60 (.51) | 5.63 (.89) | 4.00 (.66) | 5.40 (.83) |
| | Dating Enjoyment | 3.20 (.78) | 5.44 (1.03) | 3.60 (.83) | 5.47 (.74) |
| Wanting Measures | Motivation to Talk to the Partner Again | 2.93 (1.94) | 5.00 (1.46) | 4.52 (2.44) | 4.54 (.52) |
| | Motivation to Leave a Good Impression | 3.87 (1.13) | 5.56 (.81) | 5.40 (.51) | 4.53 (.74) |